



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,378	06/12/2006	Doron Korman	13004.1020	5907
35856 7590 05/03/2011 SMITH RISLEY TEMPEL SANTOS LLC Two Ravinia Drive Suite 700 ATLANTA, GA 30346				
EXAMINER				
GOYTEA, OLUSEGUN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3687				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/03/2011		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/596,378

**Applicant(s)**

KORMAN, DORON

**Examiner**

OLUSEGUN GOYEA

**Art Unit**

3687

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Prosecution Summary History*

This office action is in response to Applicant's submission filed 02/14/2011. Currently, claims 1-8 and 26-30 are pending. Claims 1-3, 6, 26-28 and 30 have been amended.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

**Claims 26-29** of the claimed invention are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 26 discloses a server for delivering medical assistance to a traveler, the server being accessible by a traveler who is traveling..., the server comprising:

- a communication module...;
- a database access module...; and
- a web-page generating module...

In light of Applicant's specification, "[e]ach unit or module may be any one of, or any combination of, software, hardware, and/or firmware." Thus, the module may be software.

Software application does not define any structural and functional

interrelationships between the software application and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer application's functionality to be realized. Software and software routines are *software per se* and are directed as non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 27-29 are rejected based on their dependence on claim 26.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claims 1 and 4** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2001/0053987 (Kleinschmidt et al. – hereinafter Kleinschmidt) in view of US 5,964,700 (Tallman et al. – hereinafter Tallman).

Referring to **claim 1**, Kleinschmidt discloses a system for delivering medical assistance to a traveler while visiting in a foreign country, the traveler utilizing a client system, the method comprising the steps of:

    sending a request to a server; [see paragraph 0013, claim 1]

    the server delivering to the client device system the medical assistance associated with the selected button;

    wherein the request determines that the medical assistance is delivered in a form selected from the group consisting of a language associated with the foreign country and a format customized to the foreign country. [see paragraph 0010, 0013 – *The output information is provided in the foreign language and format of the country the patient is located.*]

But Kleinschmidt does not explicitly disclose the limitations:

    displaying one or more selection buttons on a display of the client system, wherein each selection button is associated with at least one type of medical assistance; and receiving a selection of one of the selection buttons.

However, Tallman teaches a similar system with the limitations: displaying one or more selection buttons on a display of the client system, wherein each selection button is associated with at least one type of medical assistance; and receiving a selection of one of the selection buttons. [see col. 26, line 1 - col. 27, line 5; figures 6, 8, 18, 19, 26]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and system according to Kleinschmidt to have incorporated the limitations: displaying one or more selection buttons on a

display of the client system, wherein each selection button is associated with at least one type of medical assistance; and receiving a selection of one of the selection buttons, in accordance with the teachings of Tallman, in order to provide a user interface on the input device with buttons for selecting desired medical assistance, since so doing could be preformed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risks of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 4**, Kleinschmidt discloses system as applied in the rejection of claim 1 above, wherein the client system and server system communicate via the Internet and the step of sending the request to the server comprises sending the request over the Internet. [see paragraph 0013, figure 1 – *It is obvious that an internet connection is required to deliver a webpage or email.*]

**Claims 2, 3, 26, 27 and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2001/0053987 (Kleinschmidt) in view of US 5,964,700 (Tallman), and further in view of US 20040204837 (Singleton).

Referring to **claim 2**, the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 1 above, wherein the step of delivering the medical assistance comprises selecting medical assistance from a group consisting of:  
a translation of a prescription into the language associated with the foreign country, a translation of medical information associated with the traveler into the

language associated with the foreign country, and online medical consulting in a preferred language of the traveler. [see Kleinschmidt paragraph 0013, 0014]

But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein the step of delivering the medical assistance comprises selecting medical assistance from a group consisting of: information on the availability of medical services in the foreign country, a medical referral information in the language associated with the foreign country, and online drug consultation in the preferred language of the traveler.

However, Singleton teaches a similar method and system with the limitation: wherein the step of delivering the medical assistance comprises selecting medical assistance from a group consisting of: information on the availability of medical services in the foreign country, a medical referral information in the language associated with the foreign country, and online drug consultation in the preferred language of the traveler. [see paragraph 0006, 0007, 0054, 0057 – *Medical services provided in a foreign country can be made available to a user/patient during travel.*]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system according to the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman to have incorporated the limitation: wherein the step of delivering the medical assistance comprises selecting medical assistance from a group consisting of: information on the availability of medical services in the foreign country, a medical referral information in the language associated with the foreign country, and online drug consultation in the preferred language of the traveler, in accordance with the teachings of Singleton, in order to provide a user with medical assistance during travel,

since so doing could be preformed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risks of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 3**, the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 1 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein the at least one type of medical assistance associated with a selection button includes the provision of an over the counter (OTC) prescription available in the foreign country.

However, Singleton teaches a similar method and system with the limitation: wherein the at least one type of medical assistance associated with a selection button includes the provision of an over the counter (OTC) prescription available in the foreign country. [see paragraph 0006, 0007, 0054, 0057 – *It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the method and system can be used to provide the user/patient with available medicine/drugs during travel or in a foreign destination, as used in providing treatment/care to the patient.*]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system according to the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman to have incorporated the limitation: : wherein the at least one type of medical assistance associated with a selection button includes the provision of an over the counter (OTC) prescription available in the foreign country, in accordance with the teachings of Singleton, in order to provide a user with medical assistance during travel, since so doing could be preformed readily and easily by any person of



ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risks of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 26**, Kleinschmidt discloses a system for delivery medical assistance to a traveler, the server being accessible by a traveler who is traveling in a foreign country and operating a client device, the server comprising:

a webpage generating module for delivering the medical assistance associated with the selection buttons; and [see paragraph 0010, 0013 – *The output information is provided in the foreign language and format of the country the patient is located, in response to the request.*]

wherein the selection received by the communication module determines that the medical assistance is delivered in a form selected from the group consisting of a language associated with the foreign country and a format customized to the foreign country. [see paragraph 0010, 0013 – *The output information is provided in the foreign language and format of the country the patient is located.*]

But Kleinschmidt does not explicitly disclose the limitations: a communication module operative to communicate information illustrating a display of one or more selection buttons on a display of the client device, wherein each selection button is associated with the at least one type of medical assistance;

a communication module operative to receive a selection of one of the selection buttons; and

a database access module operative to access at least one of: a medical services and clinics database, a prescription database, a sickness database and a referral database.

However, Tallman teaches a system with the limitations: a communication module operative to communicate information illustrating a display of one or more selection buttons on a display of the client device, wherein each selection button is associated with the at least one type of medical assistance; and a communication module operative to receive a selection of one of the selection buttons. [see col. 26, line 1 - col. 27, line 5; figures 6, 8, 18, 19, 26]

In addition, Singleton teaches a system with the limitation: a database access module operative to access at least one of: a medical services and clinics database, a prescription database, a sickness database and a referral database. [see paragraph 0043, 0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system according to Kleinschmidt to have incorporated the limitations: a communication module operative to communicate information illustrating a display of one or more selection buttons on a display of the client device, wherein each selection button is associated with the at least one type of medical assistance; a communication module operative to receive a selection of one of the selection buttons; and a database access module operative to access at least one of: a medical services and clinics database, a prescription database, a sickness database and a referral database, in accordance with the teachings of Tallman and

Singleton, in order to provide a user with medical assistance during travel, since so doing could be preformed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risks of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 27**, it contains similar limitations as set forth in claim 4, and therefore is rejected based on the same rationale.

Referring to **claim 30**, it contains similar limitations as set forth in claim 26, and therefore is rejected based on the same rationale.

**Claims 5-7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2001/0053987 (Kleinschmidt) in view of US 5,964,700 (Tallman), and further in view of US 20050075909 (Flagstad).

Referring to **claim 5**, the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 1 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: further comprising a life saving article, the life saving article identifying emergency medical information that is related to the traveler and a URL for the server, and the step of sending a request to a server further comprises sending the request to the URL identified on the life saving article.

However, Flagstad teaches a system with the limitation: further comprising a life saving article, the life saving article identifying emergency medical information that is

related to the traveler and a URL for the server, and the step of sending a request to a server further comprises sending the request to the URL identified on the life saving article. [see paragraph 0048-0049, 0059]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system according to the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman to have incorporated the limitation: further comprising a life saving article, the life saving article identifying emergency medical information that is related to the traveler and a URL for the server, and the step of sending a request to a server further comprises sending the request to the URL identified on the life saving article, in accordance with the teachings of Flagstad, in order to obtain medical information about a person or traveler in case of a medical emergency, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 6**, the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman discloses the method and system as applied in the rejection of claim 5 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein the life saving article is selected from a group consisting of a necklace with a notice plate, a plastic card, a key-holder with a medical plate and a sticker.

However, Flagstad teaches a system with the limitation: wherein the life saving article is selected from a group consisting of a necklace with a notice plate, a plastic card, a key-holder with a medical plate and a sticker. [see paragraph 0022]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and system according to the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman to have incorporated the limitation: wherein the life saving article is selected from a group consisting of a necklace with a notice plate, a plastic card, a key-holder with a medical plate and a sticker, in accordance with the teachings of Flagstad, in order to obtain medical information about a person or traveler in case of a medical emergency, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 7**, the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman discloses the method and system as applied in the rejection of claim 5 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein the life saving article comprises an emergency password and the step of sending a request to the server further comprises sending the emergency password.

However, Flagstad teaches a system with the limitation: wherein the life saving article comprises an emergency password and the step of sending a request to the server further comprises sending the emergency password. [see paragraph 0048 – *The memory device contains a password number used to access medical information of the person from a service provider's website located on the memory device.*]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system according to the combination of

Kleinschmidt and Tallman to have incorporated the limitation: wherein the life saving article comprises an emergency password and the step of sending a request to the server further comprises sending the emergency password, in accordance with the teachings of Flagstad, in order to obtain medical information about a person or traveler in case of a medical emergency, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**Claim 28** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2001/0053987 (Kleinschmidt) in view of US 5,964,700 (Tallman), and further in view of US 20040204837 (Singleton) and US 20050075909 (Flagstad).

Referring to **claim 28**, the combination of Kleinschmidt, Tallman and Singleton discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 26 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: additionally comprising a life saving article selected from a group consisting of a necklace with a notice plate, a plastic card, a key-holder with a medical plate and a sticker, wherein said life saving article comprises a URL for the server for enabling the sending a request to a server via said URL.

However, Flagstad teaches a system with the limitation: additionally comprising a life saving article selected from a group consisting of a necklace with a notice plate, a plastic card, a key-holder with a medical plate and a sticker, wherein said life saving

article comprises a URL for the server for enabling the sending a request to a server via said URL. [see paragraph 0022, 0048-0049, 0059]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system according to the combination of Kleinschmidt, Tallman and Singleton to have incorporated the limitation: additionally comprising a life saving article selected from a group consisting of a necklace with a notice plate, a plastic card, a key-holder with a medical plate and a sticker, wherein said life saving article comprises a URL for the server for enabling the sending a request to a server via said URL, in accordance with the teachings of Flagstad, in order to obtain medical information about a person or traveler in case of a medical emergency, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2001/0053987 (Kleinschmidt) in view of US 5,964,700 (Tallman), and further in view of US 4803625 (Fu et al. – hereinafter referred to as Fu).

Referring to **claim 8**, the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman discloses system as applied in the rejection of claim 1 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: further comprising a medical measurement device that can be attached to the traveler and is operable to take certain medical measurements of

the traveler, and the method further comprises the step of taking the certain medical measurements and transferring the certain medical measurements to the server.

However, Fu teaches a system with the limitation: further comprising a medical measurement device that can be attached to the traveler and is operable to take certain medical measurements of the traveler, and the method further comprises the step of taking the certain medical measurements and transferring the certain medical measurements to the server. [see col. 5, lines 6-26; ]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system according to the combination of Kleinschmidt and Tallman to have incorporated the limitation: further comprising a medical measurement device that can be attached to the traveler and is operable to take certain medical measurements of the traveler, and the method further comprises the step of taking the certain medical measurements and transferring the certain medical measurements to the server, in accordance with the teachings of Fu, in order to obtain vital medical parameters about a person or traveler in case of a medical emergency, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

**Claim 29** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2001/0053987 (Kleinschmidt) in view of US 5,964,700 (Tallman), and further in view of US 20040204837 (Singleton) and US 4803625 (Fu).



Referring to **claim 29**, the combination of Kleinschmidt, Tallman and Singleton discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 26 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: additionally comprising a medical measurement device operative to be attached to said traveler and to take medical measurements of said traveler and to transfer said medical measurements to said server.

However, Fu teaches a system with the limitation: additionally comprising a medical measurement device operative to be attached to said traveler and to take medical measurements of said traveler and to transfer said medical measurements to said server. [see col. 5, lines 6-26; ]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system according to the combination of Kleinschmidt, Tallman and Singleton to have incorporated the limitation: additionally comprising a medical measurement device operative to be attached to said traveler and to take medical measurements of said traveler and to transfer said medical measurements to said server, in accordance with the teachings of Fu, in order to obtain vital medical parameters about a person or traveler in case of a medical emergency, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1-8 and 26-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on US 20030013438 (Darby), US 2004/0204837 (Singleton), US 2005/0075909 (Flagstad) and US 4,803,625 (Fu) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of US 2001/0053987 (Kleinschmidt) and US 5,964,700 (Tallman).

Regarding independent claims 1, 26 and 30, Applicant submits that the Office has rejected the claims based on a combination of Darby in view of Singleton. The applicant has closely reviewed the Darby and Singleton references and asserts that no combination of Darby and Singleton can be shown to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. The Office relies on Singleton to suggest the recited step of "sending a request to a server" and Darby to suggest the balance of the recited subject matter. The applicant submits that the Office has erred in this regard and respectfully requests reconsideration of the factual inquiries. More specifically, the applicant stands forth that at least the following recited limitations are not described, suggested, taught or rendered obvious by Darby: "...wherein... the medical assistance is delivered in...a language associated with the foreign country..."

Applicant argues that paragraph [0042] of Darby describes the "Pocket Concierge" in the context of a Japanese visitor to the U.S. (who does not speak English) leveraging a "Pocket Part with a Japanese user interface." Darby explains that the

Japanese visitor may use the Pocket Part, for example, to inquire about the availability of local goods and services. To do so, the Pocket Part, which has a Japanese language interface, is used by the Japanese visitor to place a voice call to a Call Center agent who can provide the information to the Japanese visitor in his native Japanese language. Considering this exemplary embodiment in light of Darby's entire disclosure, the Darby teaching can be essentially boiled down to a "411 service" for non-native speakers. Importantly, therefore, Darby does not describe, suggest or teach that information requested by the Japanese user may be delivered in English, i.e. a language associated with the foreign country, as is claimed.

In addition, Applicant argues that Darby at least at paragraph [0042], describes that the Pocket Part is uniquely associated with a predefined language, such as Japanese. Darby does not describe, suggest or teach that actuation of the Pocket Part interface by the user may trigger the subsequent provision of information to the user in any language other than the single language associated with the Pocket Part. That is, if a Darby user leverages a Japanese Pocket Part, then the call center agent will provide the requested information to the user in Japanese. There is no suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art of Darby that a user of a Pocket Part, such as a Japanese language Pocket Part, may have the requested data delivered in a language associated with the foreign country in which the user is present.

Further, Applicant argues that in the Detailed Action, the Office did not specifically address the above limitation (formerly recited as "delivering the medical assistance..., customized based on the selected country"). The applicant has redrafted

the limitation to more clearly, and specifically, recite that the information requested by the user may be delivered in a format that is customized to a country foreign to the user. As an example, prescriptions used in the U.S. may not be readily available from a pharmacy in a foreign country and, therefore, the claimed embodiment may amend the requested information, such as a prescription, so that it will be meaningful to a third party in a foreign country. Support for this limitation can be found in the specification at least at page 6, lines 1-5. The applicant has closely reviewed the Darby reference and was not able to find any description, suggestion or teaching that medical assistance may be delivered in a form that is customized to the foreign country in which the user is present.

Applicant submits that claims 2-8 and 27-29, each depends either directly or indirectly from allowable claims 1 or 26, and they are allowable over the cited reference.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUSEGUN GOYEA whose telephone number is (571)270-5402. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00am to 5:00pm (ET).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Gart can be reached on (571)272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/O. G./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3687  
04/27/2011

/Matthew S Gart/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3687